

REMARKS

Claims 1-22, 24-38 and 40 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claim 1 has been amended as shown on pages 2-7 of the Reply. Claim 2 has been cancelled herein. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification as filed at paragraph [0034] lines 22-28 and at paragraph [0057] lines 1-7. The indication that claims 9-22, 24-38 and 40 are allowed is noted with appreciation.

In addition, applicants' representative thanks Examiner Lewis for the courtesies extended during the teleconference of April 3, 2007. The merits of the subject claims were discussed in view of the cited document Badros, *et al.* The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendments overcome existing rejections.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C §112

Claim 1 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested in view of the amendments to this claim.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-8 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Badros, *et al.* (US 2005/0131866 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Badros, *et al.* does not teach or suggest all the features of the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation* set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). *The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.* *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicants' claimed subject matter teaches a full-text search system that can employ separately provided index schemas and ranking algorithms to efficiently generate relevant results for targeted domains. To this end amended independent claim 1 recites *a full-text search computer implemented system comprising: a plug-in component that defines a relevant score algorithm and a full-text index schema; and a search component to receive and utilize the plug-in component to query data from a data store, populate an index in accordance with the provided index schema, and utilize the index to generate a list of matching documents in order of their relevance as specified by the relevant score algorithm.* Badros, *et al.* is silent about such novel aspects of the subject claims.

Badros, *et al.* relates to a system for personalized network searching. At the cited portion, Badros, *et al.* teaches a search engine that utilizes ratings, annotations, history of use or other data associated with the previously identified uniform resource locator to locate and sort results. A user's list of favorite sites may be saved as list of bookmarks, where a bookmark includes a URL identified by the user. A user is also allowed to annotate and rate a site. The search engine utilizes these ratings, annotations and bookmarks to locate and rank results. However, Badros, *et al.* is silent regarding *a plug-in component that defines a relevant score algorithm and a full-text index schema; and a search component to receive and utilize the plug-in component to query data from a data store, populate an index in accordance with the provided index schema, and utilize the index to generate a list of matching documents in order of their relevance as specified by the relevant score algorithm* as recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn with respect to independent claim 1 and all the claims that depend there from.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP599US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROC & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731